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ABSTRACT
Positioning is a fundamental issue in mobile robot applications that can be achieved in multiple ways. Among these methods, triangulation with active beacons is widely used, robust, accurate, and flexible. In this paper, we analyze the performance of an original system, introduced in one of our previous papers, that comprises a rotating receiver and beacons that send an On-Off Keying modulated infrared signal. The probability density functions of the measured angles are established and discussed. In particular, it is shown that the proposed estimator is a non biased estimator of the beacon angular position. We also evaluate the theoretical results by means of both a simulator and measurements.

1. INTRODUCTION
In a previous paper [3], we have presented an original system for robot positioning used during the Eurobot contest since 2008. The system comprises a turning turret that measures angles based on signals sent by several infrared beacons (see Figure 1 for an illustration of the Eurobot setup). These angles, denoted $\alpha_i$, are combined, during a triangulation calculus, to compute the current position of a mobile robot in a 2D plane [1, 4]. In order to identify a beacon and to increase the robustness against noise, each beacon sends a unique binary sequence encoded as an On-Off Keying (OOK) amplitude modulated signal.

In this paper, we evaluate the error made on measured angles resulting from the coding of signals sent by the beacons. As explained in [3], the modulation of the 455 [kHz] carrier beacon signal makes it possible to identify beacons but, as a drawback, introduces errors that occur when no signal is sent, that is during an OFF period of the sequence. In the following, we address the issues raised by the use of an OOK modulation mechanism. An angle estimator is proposed and we characterize its performance by means of a simulator and experiments.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first briefly present the principle of the original positioning system described in [3]. Section 3 discusses the origin of the errors. In Section 4, we propose several estimators and compute the probability density functions of the measured angles. Then we present and discuss the experimental results in Section 5, and conclude the paper in Section 6.

2. ANGLE MEASUREMENT PRINCIPLE
The system described in [3] is an angle measurement sensor based on fixed infrared beacons, a rotating turret turning at a constant speed $\omega$, and an infrared receiver (TSOP7000). Each beacon continuously emits an infrared (IR) signal in all directions in a horizontal 2D plane. Let us denote by $\phi$ the current angular position of the receiver. As the turret turns at a constant speed, the angular position $\phi$ is directly proportional to time

$$\phi(t) = \omega t. \quad (1)$$

As a result, we can either talk about time or angular position differently. In fact, the processing unit of the positioning system measures times corresponding to angles thanks to eq. (1). Although the system measures times, we prefer to think in terms of angles, because it is more intuitive for the developments.

The receiver has a limited field of view and, consequently, the amount of infrared power collected at the receiver, denoted $P_{IR}(\phi)$, depends on the angle. Moreover, this power depends on the power emitted by the beacon and the distance between the beacon and the receiver. The exact shape of $P_{IR}(\phi)$ depends on the hardware used (receiver, optical components and geometry of turret) and, unfortunately, the information available at the receiver output is too sparse to derive a precise curve. Indeed, we have only access to the demodulated signal and no information about power is available. Therefore, we make some basic assumptions on $P_{IR}(\phi)$. Figure 2 shows a possible curve for $P_{IR}(\phi)$ (top curve). The shape of this curve has not much importance in this study but is supposed to increase from a minimum to a maximum and then to decrease from this maximum to the minimum. In the following theoretical developments, we make three important assumptions about the curve and the detection process itself:

1. The maximum occurs at an angle which is the angular position of the beacon, denoted $\phi_b$. In other words, we have, for any angle $\phi$

$$P_{IR}(\phi_b) \leq P_{IR}(\phi). \quad (2)$$

2. The curve is also supposed to be symmetric around the maximum since the turret and all optical components are symmetric. Therefore, we consider that

$$P_{IR}(\phi_b - \phi) = P_{IR}(\phi_b + \phi). \quad (3)$$

3. Finally, we suppose that the receiver reacts to $0 \rightarrow 1$ (raising) and $1 \rightarrow 0$ (falling) transitions at the same infrared power threshold $P_{th}$, respectively at an angle $\phi_1$ and $\phi_f$

$$P_{IR}(\phi_1) = P_{IR}(\phi_f) = P_{th}. \quad (4)$$

From eq. (3) and (4), we can see that $\phi_b - \phi_0 = \phi_f - \phi_0$ and, consequently, that

$$\phi_0 = \frac{\phi_0 + \phi_f}{2}. \quad (5)$$

If the beacons are assumed to send a non modulated IR signal (that is, a pure 455 [kHz] sine wave), the measurement of the angular position of a given beacon works as follows: while the turret
is turning, the receiver begins to “see” the IR signal from that beacon when the threshold $P_{th}$ is crossed upwards ($0 \rightarrow 1$ transition). The receiver will continue to receive that signal until $P_{th}$ is crossed downwards ($1 \rightarrow 0$ transition). The estimator output is depicted as $R_0$ in Figure 2. The estimator used for $\Phi_t$ is the angular position of the first rising edge at the receiver output; it is denoted by $\Phi_t$ hereafter. The estimator used for $\Phi_f$ is the angular position of the last falling edge at the receiver output; it is denoted by $\Phi_f$. These estimators are represented by the black arrows in Figure 2. The estimator $\Phi_b$ of the beacon angular position $\Phi_b$ derives from eq. (5)

$$\Phi_b = \frac{\Phi_t + \Phi_f}{2},$$

where $\Phi_t$, $\Phi_f$ and $\Phi_b$ are random variables.

Until now, we have considered that the IR signal is not modulated. But the situation is different because the IR receiver gets an On-Off Keying amplitude modulation of a 455 [kHz] carrier frequency, otherwise it would not be possible to distinguish between beacons, and this introduces some errors.

### 3. SOURCE OF THE ERRORS

Even if we would use a pure 455 [kHz] carrier, noise or other irrelevant IR signals could produce erroneous transitions at the receiver output, and consequently erroneous $\Phi_t$ or $\Phi_f$. In order to identify the different beacons and to be robust against noise, each beacon sends its own coded signal. These coded signals solve issues mentioned previously but introduce a new error, as detailed hereafter.

The receiver gets an OOK amplitude modulated signal. It means that the information can be represented only by the presence of the carrier (denoted by a 1 or ON period) or the absence of the carrier (denoted by a 0 or OFF period). The coding of the beacon signals will inevitably introduce 0’s in the emitted sequences. Let us now examine the effects of the code on the detection time. If a beacon emits a 1 while it enters into the receiver field of view, there is no error on $\Phi_t$, meaning that $\Phi_t = \Phi_b$. However, if a beacon emits a 0 while it enters the receiver field of view, there is an error on $\Phi_f$ because no signal produces a $0 \rightarrow 1$ transition at the receiver output. In fact the transition occurs later ($\Phi_f \geq \Phi_b$), at the next 1. The same consideration applies to $\Phi_f$, except that the $1 \rightarrow 0$ transition could occur sooner ($\Phi_f \leq \Phi_b$).

Such situations are illustrated in Figure 2. We first represent the output of the receiver for a non modulated carrier, $R_0$. In that case there are no errors on the transition times because the beacon constantly emits 1’s. The four other cases represent the output of the receiver for four different situations using an arbitrary code. The first case ($R_1$) does not generate errors because $P_{th}$ is reached twice while the beacon emits a 1. The second case ($R_2$) generates an error on $\Phi_t$ only because $P_{th}$ is reached in a 0 period. The third case ($R_3$) generates an error on $\Phi_f$ only and the fourth case ($R_4$) generates an error on both $\Phi_t$ and $\Phi_f$. From Figure 2, one can see that the receiver output $R_i$ for an emitted signal $E_i$ is the logical AND between $E_i$ and $R_0$. Now suppose that the OFF periods of a sequence have the same duration, denoted by $\Phi_0$ (this is the case by design). The worst case for $\Phi_t$ occurs when an OFF period starts at an angle $\phi = \Phi_b$, delaying the next transition at an angle $\Phi_t = \Phi_b + \Phi_0$. The same reasoning applies to $\Phi_f$ when an OFF period begins at an angle $\phi = \Phi_f - \Phi_0$. In both cases, the maximum absolute error on $\Phi_t$ or $\Phi_f$ is equal to $\Phi_0$. These are the worst cases but there are many combinations of these two errors. The next section evaluates the probability density functions of the estimated angles.

### 4. ERROR ANALYSIS

In order to determine the underlying statistics of the errors, we have to analyze the influence of the code on the detection times. In this section, we determine the probability density functions (PDFs) of several random variables: the angle $\Phi_t$ when the beacon enters the field of view of the receiver, the angle $\Phi_f$ when the beacon leaves the field of view of the receiver, and the angular position of the beacon $\Phi_b$, according to eq. (6).

#### 4.1 Notations

In the following, we use these notations:

- $p_0$, $p_1$: the probability to get a “0” or a “1” respectively at the IR power threshold (rising or falling edge), that is the frequency of 0 (or 1) symbols in the code. As usual, we have $p_0 + p_1 = 1$.
- $T_0$: the duration of a blank period (0 symbol) in a code. The only requirement in this study is that the blank periods of a code must all have the same duration.
- $\Phi_0$: the angle corresponding to the blank period $T_0$

$$\Phi_0 = \omega T_0. \quad (7)$$

Note that, in our design, we have: $p_0 = 1/6$, $T_0 = 30.8 \mu s$, $\omega = 10/2\pi [s]$, and $\Phi_0 = 0.111 [degree]$.

The Uniform PDF, used later, is defined as

$$U_{[a,b]}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{b-a} & \text{if } a \leq x \leq b, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

whose variance is $(b-a)^2/12$. The symmetric Triangular PDF is

$$T_{[a,b]}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{2}{b-a} - \frac{2(x-a-b)}{(b-a)^2} & \text{if } a \leq x \leq b, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$
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where \( \otimes \) denotes the convolution product.

4.2 Probability density function of \( \Phi_r \)

Errors on \( \Phi_r \) originate if a beacon is emitting a 0 symbol while entering the receiver’s field of view. Assuming time stationarity and as there is no synchronization between the beacons and the receiver, the probability to determine the correct angle, that is to have \( \Phi_r = \phi_r \), while the beacon enters the field of view of the receiver is given by \( p_r \). On the other hand, when the beacon emits a 0, the value of \( \Phi_r \) is uniformly distributed between \( \phi_r \) and \( \phi_r + \phi_0 \). Therefore, if we define \( \delta (x) \) as the Dirac delta function, then the PDF of \( \Phi_r \) is given by

\[
\Phi (\phi) = p_r \delta (\phi - \phi_r) + p_0 \Phi (\phi_r, \phi_r + \phi_0) (\phi)
\]

for \( \phi \in [-\pi, \pi] \). The mean and variance of \( \Phi_r \) are

\[
\mu_{\Phi_r} = \phi_r + \frac{p_0 \phi_0}{2},
\]

\[
\sigma_{\Phi_r}^2 = \frac{p_0 \phi_0^2}{3} - \frac{p_0 \phi_0^2}{4}.
\]

4.3 Probability density function of \( \Phi_f \)

Because the configuration is symmetric when the source leaves the field of view of the receiver, a similar result yields for \( \Phi_f \)

\[
\Phi (\phi) = p_f \delta (\phi - \phi_f) + p_0 \Phi (\phi_f, \phi_f - \phi_f) (\phi)
\]

for \( \phi \in [-\pi, \pi] \). The mean and variance of \( \Phi_f \) are

\[
\mu_{\Phi_f} = \phi_f - \frac{p_0 \phi_0}{2},
\]

\[
\sigma_{\Phi_f}^2 = \frac{p_0 \phi_0^2}{3} - \frac{p_0 \phi_0^2}{4}.
\]

4.4 Characteristics of the \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) estimators

The PDFs of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) are drawn in Figure 3. The expectations of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) have a bias given by \( \pm p_0 \phi_0 \) respectively (see eq. (12) and (15)). The bias is proportional to the blank period \( \phi_0 \) and the proportion of 0’s in a code \( p_0 \). The variances of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) are equal.

4.5 Characteristics of the estimator \( \Phi_b \)

The aim of the system being to estimate the beacon angular position \( \phi_b \), we are now interested in finding the mean and variance of \( \Phi_b \). Generally the mean and variance of a random variable are calculated with the help of the PDF. In the case of \( \Phi_b \), it is not necessary since the estimator is a function of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) (eq. (6)), whose PDFs are known. Let us first consider the mean of \( \Phi_b \)

\[
\mu_{\Phi_b} = \frac{E \{ \Phi_r \} + E \{ \Phi_f \}}{2} = \frac{\phi_r + \phi_f}{2} = \phi_0.
\]

As can be seen, the mean of \( \Phi_b \) is unbiased, despite that both the entering angle \( \Phi_r \), and leaving angle \( \Phi_f \) estimators are biased. This justifies the construction of a symmetric receiver and the use of that estimator.

Let us now derive the variance of \( \Phi_b \)

\[
\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 = \text{var} \left\{ \frac{\Phi_r + \Phi_f}{2} \right\} = \frac{\text{var} \{ \Phi_r \} + \text{var} \{ \Phi_f \}}{4}.
\]

If \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) are uncorrelated, we have [2, page 155]

\[
\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 = \frac{\text{var} \{ \Phi_r \} + \text{var} \{ \Phi_f \}}{4} = \frac{\sigma_{\Phi_r}^2 + \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2}{2},
\]

since \( \sigma_{\Phi_r}^2 = \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2 \). This could also have been derived from the PDF of \( \Phi_b \), that is given by, in the case of independent \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \)

\[
\Phi (\phi) = \frac{p_f^2 \delta (\phi - \phi_f)}{2} + 2p_f p_0 U(\phi_f - \frac{\phi_0}{2}, \phi_f + \phi_0) (\phi) + \frac{p_0^2 T(\phi_f - \frac{\phi_0}{2}, \phi_f + \phi_0)}{2} (\phi).
\]

This result is obtained by convolving the PDFs of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) [2, page 136], using eq. (10) and rescaling the result by using these properties [2]: 1) if \( Y = \alpha X \), then \( f_y (y) = \frac{1}{|\alpha|} f_x \left( \frac{y}{\alpha} \right) \), and 2) \( \delta (\alpha x) = \frac{1}{|\alpha|} \delta (x) \). This density is also depicted in Figure 3 (center). However, the non correlation or independence of \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) are questionable in our case as explained below.

To compute eq. (19) and (20), we have assumed that \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) were uncorrelated or independent. But, of course, the codes are deterministic and not random. In fact, depending on the code and the field of view \( \phi_f - \phi_r \), it is not certain that an error is possible on \( \Phi_r \) and \( \Phi_f \) simultaneously (because the durations between blank periods are fixed and known). Depending on the receiver field of view, the rotating speed and the code, four situations are possible: (1) no error is encountered, (2) an error occurs for \( \Phi_r \) only, (3) an error occurs for \( \Phi_f \) only, and (4) an error occurs for both angles.
These remarks show that the $\Phi_b$ and $\Phi_f$ variables are linked, and that the nature of the relationship depends on the field of view and the coding scheme. To establish this relationship, we should analyze, in full details, the four previous cases in function of the field of view and the different codes. However, the mean of $\Phi_b$ is always given by eq. (17), and despite the relationship between $\Phi_b$ and $\Phi_f$, $\Phi_b$ remains unbiased. To the contrary, the variance of $\Phi_b$ is no longer given by eq. (19) when $\Phi_b$ and $\Phi_f$ are correlated. Fortunately, it is possible to derive an upper bound for $\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2$. We can expand eq. (18) in [2, page 155]

$$\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 = \frac{\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 + \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2 + 2C\{\Phi_b, \Phi_f\}}{4},$$  

(21)

where $C\{\Phi_b, \Phi_f\}$ is the covariance of $\Phi_b$ and $\Phi_f$. Since, the square of the covariance is upper bounded [2, page 153]

$$C^2\{\Phi_b, \Phi_f\} \leq \sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2,$$  

(22)

and that $\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 = \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2$, we can give the upper bound of $\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2$ by using eq. (21) and (22), resulting in

$$\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2 \leq \sigma_{\Phi_f}^2 = p_0 \frac{\phi_0^2}{3} - p_0^2 \phi_0^2 \frac{\phi_0^2}{4}.$$  

(23)

5. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The expression of the upper bound of $\sigma_{\Phi_b}^2$ and the exact values for the variances of $\Phi_b$ and $\Phi_f$ (see eq. (13) and (16)) leads to the same conclusions that $p_0$ should be kept as low as possible and $\phi_0$ as short as possible to minimize the effects of the OOK modulation. In order to validate this result, we have performed some simulations and measurements. In a practical situation, we have to consider the natural (noise) variance of the system inherent to the complete system, even for a non modulated carrier (perfect case with no blank periods). This noise originates from the quartz jitter, rotation jitter, etc, and, to a larger extend, from the receiver jitter at the $0 \rightarrow 1$ and $1 \rightarrow 0$ transitions. The variance of $\Phi_b$ computed theoretically can be seen as the power of additional noise induced by the OOK modulation. From a theoretical point of view, it is correct to consider that both noise are independent and therefore that the total variance is the sum of the natural noise and the noise induced by the codes.

5.1 Measurements for different codes

In our tests, we measured the variance of the beacon angular position estimator $\Phi_b$ for different codes and fields of view. The codes used are the code 0 (non modulated carrier) to compute the natural variance of the system and three variations of code 5 with increasing blank durations (“111101111110”, “11111001111100”, “111110001111100”). The three last codes have a zero symbol probability $p_0$ equal to respectively: 1/6, 2/7, and 3/8, and a blank angle $\phi_0$ equal to respectively 19.25, 38.5, and 57.75 angle units (one angle unit represents $\frac{360}{21400} = 0.00577$ [degree]). In the following, these codes are referred to, respectively, as $C0$, $C5a$, $C5b$, and $C5c$ (details about codes may be found in [3]).

5.2 Modifying the angle of view

The field of view can be modified by changing the distance between the beacon and the receiver or by changing the beacon emitted power. For practical reasons, we choose, in our experiments, to modify the emitted power, for a fixed working distance, but we will plot the measures with respect to the field of view because the value of the emitted power has no particular relevance in this study; the receiver has only access to the field of view via the demodulated signal and it is not capable to know if the distance or the power have been modified. For each code, fifty different emitted power values were chosen ranging from about 3[mW] to 150[mW] to get an approximately linear increase of the field of view (these power values/fields of view are practical values encountered in our setup). For each code and power value, 1000 angle measurements are taken to compute the variance of $\Phi_b$. The field of view $\phi_0$ is defined as $\phi_f - \phi_0$. An estimator of the field of view is given by

$$\phi_0 = \phi_f - \phi_0.$$  

(24)

The mean of $\Phi_b$ is equal to

$$\mu_{\Phi_b} = E\{\Phi_f\} - E\{\Phi_b\},$$

$$\mu_{\Phi_b} = \left(\phi_f - p_0 \frac{\phi_0}{2}\right) - \left(\phi_f + p_0 \frac{\phi_0}{2}\right),$$

$$\mu_{\Phi_b} = -p_0 \phi_0.$$  

(25)

As can be seen, the mean of $\Phi_b$ has a bias given by $-p_0 \phi_0$. Therefore, the fields of view used to plot the data are the means of the fields of view measured for C0 for each power value (since the bias is null for C0 as $p_0 = 0$). The fields of view are shown in Figure 4 (left-hand side). The curves are linear as expected but the biases observed in the fields of view are larger than the theoretical biases (the values are given in the table of Figure 4). However they increase with $p_0$ and $\phi_0$ as predicted, and the increments between the experimental biases are consistent with the theory.

5.3 Simulator

We developed a simulator to evaluate our theory. The three parameters considered by the simulator are the coding scheme (symbols and durations), the turret period, and the field of view. The code and the turret period are known precisely in our experiments. However, to match the reality, the simulator fields of view and natural variance were extracted from the experimental measurements of C0. Simulated and experimental results are thus fully comparable. The simulated fields of view and variances are presented respectively in Figure 4 (right-hand side) and Figure 5 (left-hand side). Simulations confirm our theoretical results as bounds on variances correspond to predicted bounds and the fields of view have a bias almost equal to values predicted by eq. (25) (the numerical values are given in the table included in Figure 4).

5.4 Measurements of $\Phi_b$

The variances of the measurements are shown in Figure 5 (right-hand side). The upper bound for each code is computed after eq.
The slight discrepancy between the experimental results and theoretical bound means that one or more hypotheses about the system or the variance calculus are incorrect. But which ones? Our simulator provides values for the variances and biases of the field of view that matches our theory. This tends to confirm our major assumptions for the simulator (and the theory), which are: (1) the natural variance is independent of the variance added by a code and (2) the natural variance is the same whatever the code used. However, a detailed analysis of the receiver hardware shows the presence of an “Automatic Gain Control” (AGC) loop between the input and the demodulator. Typically, the gain is set to a high value when no signal is present for a “long time”, resulting in a very noisy first transition ($\Phi_1$ in our case). This gain then decreases over time, resulting in sharper transitions (especially the last one, $\Phi_f$ in our case). This characteristic is clearly identifiable from the variance of $\Phi_1$, $\Phi_f$, and $\Phi_{1/f}$ for a non modulated signal (C0). Indeed, for C0, the variance of $\Phi_{1/f}$ stretches from about 250 to 500 whereas the variance of $\Phi_f$ stretches from about 7 to 20. It appears that the gain value depends on the past values of the received signal and the duration of blank periods, and this produces a non constant natural variance over time. If the natural variance evolves over time, we have to consider this effect to tighten the agreement between theoretical and practical results. But it is not trivial to consider this effect because it relates to the hardware used. Finally, note that despite that evolutions of both $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_{1/f}$ variance are quasi linear, the curve of $\Phi_1$ is not linear with respect to the field of view. This confirms that there exists a dependency between $\Phi_1$ and $\Phi_{1/f}$ (this effect is most visible for the CSc curve).

6. CONCLUSIONS
This paper analyzes the errors on the measured angles of a positioning system described in [3]; one of the main issues is that it uses an On-Off Keying modulation mechanism. We propose a statistical estimator for the angular localization of a beacon and show that this estimator is unbiased and that its variance is theoretically upper bounded by $p_0 \frac{\alpha_1}{3} - p_0 \frac{\alpha_2}{3}$. This variance represents the power noise due to the OOK modulation; it increases with the blank angle $\phi_0$ and with the proportion of zero symbols in a code $p_0$ (if $p_0 < \frac{3}{5}$). This study also justifies some practical choices made in [3], in particular: (1) the building of a symmetric optical part, (2) the reduction of $p_0$ versus $p_1$, and (3) the reduction of $\phi_0$ (or equivalently $\Phi_0$).

In the second part of this paper, we present experimental results for the variance of the beacon position due to the OOK modulation and also present the framework of a simulator that was developed to evaluate our theory. The results of the simulator are coherent with our theoretical results, but experimental results are slightly different. Experimental results enlighten that the natural variance of the system depends on the code used because of the Automatic Gain Control loop of the receiver, explaining why the experimental results do not match the theoretical bounds exactly. Whereas the experimental and simulated results differ a little, their general shape are the same, meaning that this theory seems coherent. In a practical situation, we want to limit the variance added by the codes against the natural variance of the system. The theoretical bound computed in this paper as well as the simulator may help this purpose. Note that our system achieves a remarkably low noise level on angles. Experimental values encountered in our system for the standard deviation of $\Phi_0$ range from 0.056 to 0.078 [degree].

This study supposes the robot does not move during measurement. Indeed, the robot has to stop from time to time to perform some specific tasks (like grab a ball for example). We can take advantage of this situation to get better estimates of the angles to give to the triangulation calculus. If the robot moves, the estimated value for the beacon angular position has an additional error because the robot position has changed during the measurement. This has no real impact on the performance because the acquisition duration for the measurement is small compared to the robot speed (a typical acquisition duration is 2 [ms], which represents a displacement of 2 [mm] if the robot moves at 1 [m/s]). However, in our positioning system, we take this additional error into account by increasing the variance with a value proportional to the robot speed.
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